



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/610,580	07/05/2000	Shamoun Murtza	81866.0028	4751

26021 7590 11/26/2003

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.
500 S. GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 1900
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2611

EXAMINER

LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/610,580

Applicant(s)

MURTZA ET AL.

Examiner

Christian La Forgia

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 17 September 2003 is noted and made of record.
2. Claims 1 through 20 are presented for examination.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because certain parts of Figures 2 and 3 are missing numbers. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
4. Applicant is reminded that the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes and that it is applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected in accordance with the instructions set forth in Paper No. 7, mailed on 11 June 2003.
5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 2, block 42. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "16" has been used to designate a transaction between a Domain Name Server and a web browser, a transaction between a web browser and two servers, a web browser and the Registrar, and the URL Forward Manager and browser. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

7. The use of the trademarks Cisco, Network Appliance, and Oracle has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

8. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

9. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Response to Amendment

10. The reply filed on 11 September 2003 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): responses to the drawing and specification objections. See 37 CFR 1.111.

Response to Arguments

11. The Applicant states that by amending the drawings the applicant would violate 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5). The Examiner duly notes the two other patent applications that are copending, and understands that these drawings are wholly understandable in light of the present specification and the incorporated patent applications, yet the Examiner would like further clarification before withdrawing the objections to the drawings.

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2131

13. See further rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

15. Claims 1 through 11, 13 through 15, and 17 through 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,751,956 to Kirsch, hereinafter Kirsch, in lieu of obviousness.

16. As per claim 1, Kirsch teaches a URL processing system, comprising:

a first web server adapted to receive a request for a first URL and return a message associated with the first URL request, the first URL identifying a first IP address of the first web server according to a domain name system (column 5, lines 22-41; column 6, lines 40-46);

a file server associated with and accessible by the first web server, the file server adapted to store a plurality of files corresponding to a plurality of URLs, the plurality of URLs associated with a plurality of IP addresses, a first file associated with the first URL accessed contains a second IP address of a first destination server, the first web server returning the second IP address as part of the message in response to the first URL request (Figure 2 [block 32]; column 7, lines 3-5; column 9, lines 2-50);

a second web server associated with the file server, the second web server adapted to receive a request to alter the second IP address within the first file to modify the association between the first URL and the second IP address of the first destination server, wherein the request to alter the association between the first URL and the second IP address is provided through a domain management interface having a process for authenticating a user's right to

Art Unit: 2131

modify contents of the first file (Figures 3 [blocks 56, 58], 4 [block 72]; column 5, lines 22-41; column 10, lines 18-35; column 10, line 58 to column 11, line 4). Kirsch does not teach a file server. Kirsch suggests a file server in his discussion of a persistent data storage device. Kirsch discusses evaluating the redirection URL as being computational in nature, only bound by input/output access. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a file server could perform the necessary computations thereby reducing the amount of computing to be done by the first server, allowing the first server to handle more redirection requests. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to swap the persistent storage device with a file server.

17. Regarding claim 2, Kirsch teaches wherein a domain name server within a domain name system associates the first URL with the first IP address for the first web server after the request to alter is completed (Figures 3 [blocks 54, 56], 4 [blocks 72]; column 10, lines 18-35; column 10, line 58 to column 11, line 4).

18. Regarding claim 3, Kirsch teaches wherein the file server stores the plurality of files in a directory format with the names of the files comprising URL data associated with the URLs associated with the IP addresses (column 9, lines 2-25; column 10, lines 59-65). Although Kirsch does not explicitly cite including the IP addresses along with the URLs, Kirsch does teach storing the files in a database format. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the IP addresses of the URLs in the database entries. One would be

Art Unit: 2131

motivated to include the IP addresses along with the URLs primarily for aesthetic purposes, see *In re Seid*, 161 F.2d 229, 231, 73 USPQ 431, 433 (CCPA 1947). See MPEP § 2144.04.

19. With regards to claim 4, Kirsch teaches wherein the URL data comprises domain names and the directory organizes the plurality of files according to alphabetic ordering of the domain names (column 9, lines 2-25; column 10, lines 59-65). Although Kirsch does not explicitly cite organizing the plurality of files in alphabetical order, Kirsch does teach storing the files in a database format. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store the files in alphabetical order. One would be motivated to organize the domain's in alphabetical order primarily for aesthetic purposes, see *In re Seid*, 161 F.2d 229, 231, 73 USPQ 431, 433 (CCPA 1947). See MPEP § 2144.04.

20. With regards to claim 5, Kirsch teaches wherein the plurality of files are stored in a common file space of an array of hard disks (Figure 2 [block 32]; column 7, lines 3-7; column 9, lines 2-25).

21. Regarding claim 6, Kirsch teaches wherein the first file includes advertising information specifying whether advertising is to be added to the response to the first URL request, the first destination server adding advertising to the response according to the advertising information (column 7, line 42 to column 8, line 2).

Art Unit: 2131

22. With regards to claim 7, Kirsch teaches wherein the advertising is provided in a frame of a framed web page (column 7, line 42 to column 8, line 2).

23. With regards to claim 8, Kirsch teaches wherein advertising is slot added according to the advertising information (column 7, line 42 to column 8, line 2).

24. Regarding claim 9, Kirsch teaches wherein the first destination server returns the response without adding advertising (column 7, line 42 to column 8, line 2).

25. Regarding claim 10, Kirsch teaches wherein the domain management interface includes a browser (column 10, lines 24-35).

26. Regarding claims 11, 15, and 19, Kirsch teaches wherein the domain management interface includes a browser having an active domain name designated in the browser, wherein URL forwarding is selected through a hyperlink (column 6, lines 32-46; column 7, line 42 to column 8, line).

27. Regarding claim 13, Kirsch teaches wherein when the second web server alters the second IP address within the first file to modify the association between the first URL and the second IP address of the first destination server, no message is communicated to a domain name system (column 10, line 54 to column 11, line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to eliminate the message and its function. One

Art Unit: 2131

would be motivated to remove this function as it would save time and bandwidth by restricting the amount of traffic entered on the network by the servers. See *In re Karlson*, 311 F.2d 581, 583, 136 USPQ 184, 186 (CCPA 1963); see *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975). See MPEP § 2144.04.

28. With regards to claims 14 and 18, Kirsch teaches wherein the first file includes advertising information specifying whether advertising is to be added to the response to the first URL request, the first destination server adding advertising to the response according, to the advertising information (column 7, line 42 to column 8, line 2).

29. Regarding claim 17, Kirsch teaches wherein the response is a web page stored on the first destination server (column 6, lines 47-59).

30. Claims 12, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,298,341 to Mann et al., hereinafter Mann.

31. Regarding claims 12, 16, and 20, Kirsch does not teach wherein the second web server is a registrar web server.

32. Mann teaches wherein the second web server is a registrar web server (column 2, lines 35-38). Kirsch suggests keeping an accurate and up-to-date record of redirection URLs throughout the patent. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize that a registrar web server as taught by Mann would aid in keeping the up-to-date

Art Unit: 2131

records discussed by Kirsch, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the second web server be a registrar web server.

Conclusion

33. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

34. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (703) 305-7704. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

36. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7240.

37. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/610,580

Page 10

Art Unit: 2131

Christian La Forgia
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131

clf



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100